

JAN 25 1941

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 34, NO. 11

January 13, 1941

WHOLE NO. 911

## CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, 1940

### REVIEWS

HOSLETT, Lucretius: His Genius and his Moral Philosophy (*Hadzsits*);  
FARRINGTON, Science and Politics in the Ancient World (*Drabkin*);  
BENDZ, Index verborum Frontiniani (*Young*); COOPER, Aristotelian  
Papers (*DeWitt*); STEINER, Vincent of Beauvais de eruditione filiorum  
nobilium (*Sister Anne Stanislaus*); BALLINI, Valore giuridico della  
celebrazione nuziale cristiana (*Pack*); FRANK, Economic Survey of  
Ancient Rome 5 (*Oldfather*); JONES, Greek City from Alexander to  
Justinian (*Rostovtzeff*)

### ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

### RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Just Published—

## GREEK POPULAR RELIGION

BY MARTIN P. NILSSON

*The fullest account to date of the  
dynamic religion of ancient Greece*

\$2.50

Remember also—

THE ROMAN'S WORLD

by Frank Gardner Moore

\$3.75

GREEK LIFE AND THOUGHT

by La Rue Van Hook

\$2.50

*Write for full information*

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS · MORNINGSIDE HEIGHTS · NEW YORK

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor; Jotham Johnson, Associate Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Penna.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, 418 South Wycombe Avenue, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Eugene W. Miller, Norman T. Pratt, Bluma L. Trell, Edna White.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 34 contains issues dated: October 7, 14, 21, 28; November 4, 18; December 2, 9, 16 (1940); January 6, 13, 20; February 10, 24; March 3, 10, 17, 24, 31; April 14, 21, 28; May 5, 12, 19; June 2 (1941).

## CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, 1940

The Archaeological Institute of America and the American Philological Association met at Baltimore on December 26-28.

To the archaeologists Mrs. Kirsopp Lake reported that a preliminary sounding at Tilke Tepe near Van yielded in the lowest strata painted pottery of the Tell Halaf period. Lawrence Angel of Harvard University presented the results of a study of 225 male skulls, chiefly from Boeotia, Attica, Corinth and the Argolid, dating from the neolithic to the late Byzantine period: "The periods of high culture coincide with periods of relatively low physical variability and follow periods of heterogeneity or high variability often connected with racial influx." This was fairly tough going for most of the electorate, including your correspondent, who made a note to inform himself better on this subject in 1941.

Jerome Sperling of Yale University made a systematic exploration of Elis in 1939; he now reports the discovery of many hitherto unknown sites, identified by surface finds as of the Early Bronze, Late Bronze, Classical and Graeco-Roman periods. Mrs. A. J. B. Wace showed the handsome new ivory from the palace at Mycenae, a group consisting of an older woman and a younger woman, in flounced skirts, and a small boy: possibly Demeter, Persephone and Triptolemus; but Professor Mary Swindler, speaking from the floor, thought it might prove to be Syro-Phoenician.

Pentelic marble replacements of original Parian marble elements (the end figures of the west pediment, roof tiles, lion spouts) of the temple of Zeus at Olympia tell of ancient damage to the temple and subsequent repair. William Bell Dinsmoor of Columbia University has made a census of the surviving stones so far discovered and recognized: some cornice blocks, capitals and drums from the gable ends contain large lewis holes not original to them, and therefore had been lifted down and returned to place in antiquity; of the north-east corner column, for example, all the drums but two were moved. Such rebuilding must have been prompted by an earthquake which without bringing the temple down shook many drums and blocks out of line and

did other damage, perhaps in the neighborhood of 175 B.C. Pausanias 4.31.6 says that Damophon repaired ivory in the Pheidias Zeus which had cracked; dehydration could explain this, or it may have been another incident of the same earthquake.

A relief in the Lateran shows preparations for the murder of Pelias: a daughter of Pelias stands r., pensive with dagger drawn, another fetches a cauldron, and Medea enters l. with a box of herbs. Rhys Carpenter of Bryn Mawr College identified this as an Attic original of the early fourth century; but the Pelias with drawn dagger is adapted from a Medea Plotting the Murder of Her Children. Looking for the prototype of this figure, Dr. Carpenter found it in a Roman copy, the so-called *Thusnelda* in the Loggia dei Lanzi at Florence, and ascribed the original to the school of Polyclitus. This should cause considerable consternation among those commentators who have called attention to the realism with which the '*Thusnelda*' studies a captive German woman.

Easily the most important paper was that of W. Duncan Strong of Columbia University: Recent Discoveries in New World Archaeology, under which he spoke of finds from five centers in the Americas: the Great Plains, where traces of the Folsom culture going back twelve thousand years or more were found; Tierra del Fuego at the extreme tip of South America, where human remains were associated with those of animals extinct five to seven thousand years; Alaska, where the Eskimo migrations from Asia at about the time of Christ now begin to be understood; Peru, where an amazing pre-Inca culture has been discovered; and Vera Cruz, with an advanced new culture contemporary with the earliest Maya remains.

On Thursday evening Arthur Stanley Pease of Harvard University, delivered an address entitled *Caeli Enarrant*. The dinner meeting on Friday heard a symposium on *The American Schools in the Mediterranean Crisis*: Rhys Carpenter, Nelson Glueck, T. Leslie Shear and Carl Roebuck spoke respectively on the School at Rome, the School at Jerusalem, the Athenian Agora and the School at Athens.

The 1941 meeting is to be held at Hartford.

J. J.

## REVIEWS

**Lucretius: His Genius and his Moral Philosophy.** By SCHUYLER DEAN HOSLETT. vii, 48 pages. Midland Publishers, Kansas City 1939

I have read this book with interest and I am sure that many a layman would be stimulated by the manner of presentation that Professor Hoslett has adopted. I, therefore, wish that the booklet might fall into the hands of those who might be aroused to unexpected admiration for a new planet suddenly swimming into their ken. Books and articles of this kind may serve an important purpose and I should welcome a flood of appreciations of a similar kind to arouse the minds of the American people to recognition of the importance to them of some knowledge of the great figures of Greek and Roman life and letters.

Mr. Hoslett has undertaken to discuss, within the scope of 46 pages, the Life of Lucretius, Epicurus, the Moral Philosophy and Genius of Lucretius—an impossible task you will say to perform adequately and with justice to these topics. True enough, and errors are sure to creep into any brief account of this character but it would be as ungracious to dwell upon these here as it would be stupid to make a display of academic erudition. Any Lucretian scholar will discover these errors and will not require my suggestions. Unhappily this review will never reach those whom I should especially like to reach. This booklet is, in effect, a popular lecture addressed not to critical scholars but to that wider audience of intelligent readers who of necessity derive much of their knowledge from only casual contacts with problems of economics, political history, science, literature, or philosophy.

Millions, perhaps, owe a great obligation to brief essays appearing in popular magazines and the editors of *The Reader's Digest* are well aware of that important fact. I know of no other way to make the American public classically-minded more effective than brief, enthusiastic expositions. We classicists must learn to stoop to conquer. Socrates is, I am sure, an indistinct and perhaps an all but unknown character to myriads of men and women, our schools and colleges notwithstanding and in spite of the large literature devoted to the career of the great philosopher. Even the significant conjunction of Socrates and Christ made by Professor Wenley in his book bearing that title has probably been largely forgotten, and it is possible that little books like Professor Hoslett's in character and scope would do more to arouse interest and curiosity than larger and more authentic works. Popularization of the best kind is not to be scorned, as W. W. Fowler recognized long ago, and as many classical scholars are aware at the present time. It is done in colleges and lecture work every day. Missionary work outside of the

classroom might take many forms; this little book represents one.

The translations of great passages in Lucretius, bound together by an illuminating or provocative running commentary, give a glimpse, at least, of a great mind, and that glimpse, it seems to me, must be exciting enough to the reader, unfamiliar with the subject, who will never read Sellar, Santayana, Shorey, Sikes, much less Zeller. Let us have hundreds of these little monographs. A brief bibliography of a few leading and authoritative works on Lucretius and translations is given in this book.

I do not mean, at any time, to condone actual errors of fact or, in this place, to challenge questionable expressions of opinion; rather, I should like to emphasize that real personality must be behind writing of this kind and the essential thing in work of this sort is to put a message across a great chasm—and Mr. Hoslett has done it. This is, in any case, the secret of all effective teaching.

GEORGE DEPUE HADZSITS

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

**Science and Politics in the Ancient World.** By BENJAMIN FARRINGTON. 243 pages. Oxford University Press, New York 1940 \$2.50

Professor Farrington's thesis is that there were two major obstacles to the development of science in Greece and Rome, the prevalence of an economy based on slavery, and the systematic opposition of the ruling classes to the enlightenment of the people. The present volume is devoted to a discussion of the second of these obstacles. The author traces what he holds to be a conscious and generally successful effort to keep the people in the paralyzing grip of superstition through the agency of a politically controlled state religion. It is against this background that he seeks to interpret ancient science.

Ancient science has generally been treated without much regard for the political, social, and economic environment in which it developed. To the extent that it seeks to correct this tendency, the spirit of Professor Farrington's attempt can be wholeheartedly welcomed. But in my opinion the author has not faced the extreme complexity even of the single aspect of the problem he has chosen to treat. In emphasizing the omissions of his predecessors, he has fallen into the opposite error of viewing all scientific achievement or failure of achievement as determined by the play of economic and political forces. Not only does he neglect other pertinent forces, but, with very few exceptions, gives us no thorough analysis of the impact of the political and economic forces themselves on those geniuses whose history forms, in large measure, the history of scientific achievement.

In addition, what I consider to be a profound fallacy runs through the book, a failure to see the true relationship of mutual interaction between theoretical science and its technological applications, and a consequent disparagement of the former in contrast with the latter.<sup>1</sup> Almost with condescension are the glorious achievements of Greek mathematics referred to. Concern with theory and abstraction and a supposed distaste for the concrete and the useful are viewed as an expression of an aristocratic bias.

Now aesthetic motives and what has been called the play motive can hardly be overstressed as constructive forces in the development of Greek science, and certainly need no apology. But it may further be pointed out that again and again a discovery in pure mathematics or theoretical physics, made with no thought of usefulness or application, has in time had a decisive technological importance. And the very failure with which the Greeks are taxed by Professor Farrington and many others—the failure to found a fruitful science of dynamics—can, I think, be shown to be due not to too abstract and theoretical an approach, but to a failure to carry abstraction and rational analysis far enough to arrive at ideal cases of motion.

The emphasis on abstraction and pure mathematics in Pythagoras and Plato is in particular deplored by Professor Farrington for having retarded the development of science. But are we to overlook the well supported tradition which credits to the early Pythagoreans the first recorded quantitative experiments, those in connection with the laws of vibrating strings? Or the importance of Plato's formulation of the basic problem of astronomy, in answer to which Eudoxus developed the first of the great astronomical systems, that of homocentric spheres? Or the profound inspiration which Plato gave to scientists of his own and subsequent ages? It will perhaps suffice to indicate that the methodological tradition represented in the schools of Pythagoras and Plato and later, for example, in Archimedes, Hipparchus, and Ptolemy, is the very tradition in which physical science from Galileo and Newton to our own day has made its greatest conquests.

It is indicative of the one-sidedness and insufficiency of Professor Farrington's treatment that few of the great names of Greek science are even mentioned in his book. Instead the emphasis is on the work of Epicurus and Lucretius.

Now few today would quarrel with the author's high regard for Epicurus and Lucretius as liberators of men from superstition. Professor Farrington has written with deep feeling and penetration on the political abuse of religion, has paid tribute to Epicurus for his desire

to bring light where darkness had been imposed as a matter of policy, and has cogently criticised the all too common view of Lucretius as battling against men of straw. And it is undoubtedly true that until recent years certain subtle values of Epicurus's thoughts on nature have not been properly appreciated. The spontaneity in Epicurean physics, which moved the ancients to ridicule, finds a counterpart in scientific thought today.

But it is none the less true that in the great achievements of Greek science neither did Epicurus participate nor did he inspire others to participate. I refer not merely to pure mathematics and astronomy, but to the investigations in mechanics, optics, hydrostatics, acoustics, and pneumatics, of men like Archimedes, Ctesibius, Philo of Byzantium, Hero of Alexandria, and Ptolemy, and, in the case of the biological sciences, to the work of observation and classification such as we find in the Hippocratic Corpus, Aristotle, and Theophrastus, and to anatomical and physiological observation and experiment in Erasistratus, Herophilus, Rufus, and Galen. Discussions of the complex relationship between these men of genius, whom Professor Farrington scarcely mentions, and the social, political, and economic environment in which they worked—to mention but one instance, the effects of the royal patronage of higher learning at Alexandria—are still far from adequate.

Epicurus, to whom Professor Farrington devotes so large a portion of his book, is the outspoken critic of the painstaking methods used by the men I have mentioned and is wholly out of sympathy and touch with what has proved to be of permanent value in Greek science. Where Archimedes, Aristarchus, Eratosthenes, Hipparchus, Posidonius and Ptolemy apply geometry and trigonometry to the problem of the size of the earth, and the sizes and distances of the heavenly bodies, Epicurus stubbornly maintains that the sun and the moon are no larger than they appear to be.

Through the book there runs another fallacy that requires mention. It is the constant talk of and search for reasons for what is called the "failure" of Greek science. Often, on analysis, this "failure" turns out to be merely a failure to reach the stage of modern science. In the same sense men will one day speak of the failure of present-day science. Now surely the important thing to note is that over a considerable period of time the Greeks achieved the highest expression of what we call scientific method. That their results were ultimately superseded is in the very nature of the cumulative character of scientific knowledge. It is, to be sure, interesting to consider reasons why in this or that particular a certain fruitful analogy or a certain mode of analysis was not arrived at earlier. This involves for each scientist and each problem a complex investigation into which the characteristics of the social and economic environment may enter as factors of

<sup>1</sup> A discerning view of the complexity of this relationship and the rôle of the social order as affecting it, along with some pertinent applications to ancient science, is to be found in papers by Henry E. Sigerist (*Science and Society* 2 [1938] 291ff.) and D. J. Struik (*ibid.* 1 [1936] 81ff.).



more or less importance. But Professor Farrington considers no other factors and indeed applies these factors to hardly more than a minute fraction of Greek scientific activity.

What I have said by way of criticism does not invalidate the real service that the book does perform—to challenge historians of science to study ancient science not as divorced from but as an integral part of a complex civilization, and especially to consider with more penetration than has been the case hitherto the "history of the warfare of science with theology" in antiquity. That the present effort has not succeeded is due both to the magnitude of the problem and to the author's wholly inadequate view of what scientific achievement is and the factors which bring it about.

ISRAEL E. DRABKIN

TOWNSEND HARRIS HIGH SCHOOL, NEW YORK

**Index verborum Frontiniani Verba quae Strategematibus continentur cuncta complectens.** By GERHARD BENDZ. 92 pages. Gleerup, Lund 1939 (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 34, Nr. 4a) 3 kr.

That Gerhard Bendz should be diligently concentrating his attention in a peaceful manner upon a bellicose subject in a Europe thundering with bombs may seem a weird paradox. Although it probably cannot be averred that Frontinus' Strategies would be auxiliary to military science and the tactics of World War II, yet one cannot gainsay that the subject matter has timely aspects.

This review, however, is not to discuss the subject matter of Frontinus, but the Index verborum Frontiniani. The major shortcoming of the work manifests itself in the title, namely, that it deals only with the Strategemata. The two chief contributions of an index are that it facilitates detailed study of the author and comparative studies with other authors. Obviously, an index dispensing with two-fifths of what an author wrote is proportionately reduced in its value as a research tool.

This index, while it makes accessible references to all occurrences of every word, does not paint a picture of the word; that is, it lists only the first form of each word. The consultant must find out for himself when *elephantos*, *eius*, *tutum*, *transtulit* are the forms used, for they are listed under *elephantus*, *is*, *tutus*, and *transfere*, respectively. At least the indexer spared himself much mental fatigue in trying to distinguish between identical forms, or shall we give him the benefit of the doubt and say that he did not want to bias the syntactical interpretations of his consultants?

Anyone who has endeavored to compile an index verborum is fully aware how difficult it is to be consistent. Harmony may even be enhanced by the proper

resolution of strategically placed discords. Bendz seems to have too many inconsistencies that I think would be difficult for him to justify. Why, for example, does he distinguish between *et . . . et*, *neque . . . et*, and *et . . . etiam*, and not between *aut . . . aut*? Why should he indicate when *in* is followed by the accusative and when by the ablative, and not make the same indications with *sub*?

One who is linguistically minded would get a much more comprehensive view of an author's use of a word if its forms were listed under one heading. For example, it seems to me that the occurrence of *multo*, *plures*, *plurimus*, and *plus* would be much more satisfactorily listed under the positive form *multus* than under the headings used. The author does, however, give a cross reference to the other forms. On the other hand, some of the cross references come near being glossological monstrosities; for example "*fue*-, v. *sum*."

Frontinus commonly uses adjectives substantively, and the consultant of this index would appreciate having this use of adjectives pointed out, for example, *pro incurioso*, 2:14.

The references are to pages and lines of the Teubner text, an arrangement not entirely unsatisfactory, to be sure, yet by not using book and chapter references, the author confines the consultant to the use of one edition.

One of the moot problems in Frontinus has been the authorship of the fourth book. Helen M. Connor in *A Study of the Syntax of the Strategemata of Frontinus* (Cornell Publications Company, Ithaca 1921) felt that there was no evidence to indicate that the same author had not written the four books. This index is the sine qua non enabling one to make a conclusive study of the problem.

After a rather careful and comprehensive sampling, I have found neither omissions nor errors, for which accuracy Bendz should be commended. He has, however, by listing only the first form of each word considerably reduced the possibility of errors.

NORMA D. YOUNG

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

**Aristotelian Papers.** Revised and Reprinted. By LANE COOPER. x, 237 pages. Cornell University Press, Ithaca 1939 \$2.50

This neat and attractive volume is evenly divided between eight articles and ten reviews, followed by an index of eleven pages. Only the article on Galileo and Scientific History lies quite outside the field of Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics. The reviews present no roll-call of Lilliputia. The big names are there: Ross on Aristotle, Smyth on Aeschylus, Stocks' 'Aristotelianism', Burnet on Aristotle, and Coleridge, Wordsworth and Mr. Lowes. The author finds most to commend in

Bywater and Gudeman but good in all, and his strictures on a few, however unsparing and well certified, are never impatient or unkindly. He is a genuine humanist, stemming from a sound tradition of the renaissance.

Upon one occasion he said to me, "When Aristotle says 'What is it?' he usually means 'What is it called? What is its name?'" Somewhat later I was rummaging in Plato's *Epistles* and found myself reminded (VII 342) that the name of a thing is one of five entities: the name, the definition, the image, the individual concept, and the eternal idea. In other words, a name is a step toward understanding. How hampered we should find ourselves if we had many substances like the unnamed element in the soul according to Epicurus! Yet his utility is not the whole point. A name was more than an instrument to a Greek; it was an entity. Now and then we come close to understanding the Greek mind, without quite threading the needle. Lane Cooper knows.

Upon another occasion he said, "When Aristotle quotes, he means the whole passage of which he cites the first words. The point of the quotation will often be found further along." This reminded me of the bad boy in the third mime of Herondas—now Herodas, I believe—who made a mess of his memorization from tragedy. "Why, your grandmother could do it," says his mother. The Greeks seem to have known their poets as the old folks knew their Bibles. Give them the first words of a chapter like "Remember now thy Creator—" and they could carry on with the rest of it. Socrates and Plato preached assiduously about the use of reason, but they took the liberal use of the memory for granted. Their assumptions are sometimes as illuminating as their express teachings. The student of the Rhetoric will soon bog down unless he knows the background of Greek education.

Former pupils of Lane Cooper will rehearse for you his statement that a liberal education might be gained from three texts: the Bible, Shakespeare, and Milton. This is one of those sayings which Aristotle says reveal the *ἦθος* of the speaker, and the measure of this *ἦθος* will be more precisely taken by those whose birth-date is sufficiently remote to antedate Progressivism, when children still ate bread and milk and were compelled, even in tears, to memorize choice passages of Scripture, incomprehensible at the time, against the day when the meaning and the beauty would reveal themselves.

According to Aristotle, *Poetics* VI5, there are but two springs of action, *ἦθος* and *διάνοια*, and since writing is action to a scholar, this book, compiled and revised by the author, is autobiography. By their works ye shall know them. What of the *ἦθος* and the *διάνοια* that are revealed? We recognize a man with a singular interest in the behavior of the human mind toward language as an instrument of artistic expression. It is

this interest that bestows unity upon the simultaneous study of Wordsworth and Aristotle. It is the desire to possess excellent tools for this study that has prompted Lane Cooper to compile concordances. His *ἦθος* is that of a master-workman; as such he takes pride in making master-workmen of his students; note his generous references to Drummond, Caplan, Hutton and others, who will perpetuate his methods. Read a select list of his writings in the Preface; the epideictic category is lacking; the aim of every book in the list is to afford guidance and assistance to others.

In the case of a scholar it is particularly hard to say with certainty that one trait has its origin in the mind and the other in the character. If compelled, however, to select something characteristic of Lane Cooper's *διάνοια* I would choose this: to understand the meaning of *κόσμος* and *ἐνθυμήματα* (103) or *κάθαρσις*, it is necessary to read diligently the text of the poets themselves. This advice, however simple, is the secret of understanding literary criticism. Without the discovery and adoption of this method our author would never have made such substantial contributions to English and classical scholarship.

Some few years ago a well known American professor was presented in Geneva to a titled British scholar as "of Cornell University." "Ah," said the knight, "one of the better ones, I believe." It is the work of men like Lane Cooper that compels the recognition of a university, even among the supercilious, as being "one of the better ones."

NORMAN W. DEWITT

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

**Vincent of Beauvais. De eruditione filiorum nobilium.** Edited by ARPAD STEINER. xxxii, 236 pages. Mediaeval Academy of America, Cambridge 1938 (Publications of the Mediaeval Academy No. 32) \$3.50

Mr. Steiner's edition of Vincent of Beauvais' *De eruditione filiorum nobilium* contains a very instructive introduction divided into seven sections. The first section discusses the significance of the treatise. Here the editor states the contradictory opinions of various scholars as to its value: "F. C. Schlosser, the noted historian, found it worthy of translation into German; F. von Raumer called it 'a remarkable and intelligent book'; K. Schmidt assigned it considerable space in his voluminous history of education; W. Munch asserted that Vincent's work was considered highly authoritative in its day. On the other hand, B. Haureau, in a very hasty sketch, judged it a mere jumble of citations, and Bientinesi found it merely an echo of Hugh of St. Victor, Richard of St. Victor, and Alfarabi. Whereas R. Limmer was more or less noncommittal in his views,

R. Friedrich's verdict is most laudatory: he declared it, with some exaggeration, the first comprehensive educational treatise in Christian literature" (Introduction xi-xii). According to Vincent himself, *De eruditione filiorum nobilium* was an anthology of passages taken from sacred and profane writers. The purpose of the treatise was to provide suitable matter for the edification and education of the children of King Louis IX.

The second section discusses the date of the composition of this educational treatise. Since it was written for the children of Louis IX, Isabelle, Louis, and Philippe, who were born in the years 1242, 1244, and 1245, respectively, the treatise could not have been written before 1245 and was probably written later, in either 1247 or 1249.

The sources of the treatise are fully discussed in the third section. *De eruditione* contains nearly 900 non-scriptural citations which vary in importance. These are not all direct quotations; some were modified by Vincent to suit his purpose. Mr. Steiner states in this section that probably Vincent did not always cite from the original text but often quoted from florilegia and from other authors.

According to the tables given in this section, Vincent of Beauvais quoted from 42 ancient authors of whom Ovid ranks highest with a total of 60 citations. Close to him stands L. Annaeus Seneca with 57. There are four Christian Latin poets from whom passages were cited, but only a total of 9 selections. From Patristic Literature 24 authors are quoted, 8 of whom are Greek and 16 Latin. Of these writers 148 quotations are taken from the writings of St. Jerome and 75 from St. Augustine. Three Arabic authors are listed, 9 authors of Scholastic literature, and 14 of miscellaneous medieval literature. Among the 9 authors in Scholastic literature, Hugh of St. Victor and Bernard of Clairvaux rank highest with 46 and 45 quotations respectively. Steiner notes in this section that citations from ancient authors are generally rather brief while those from patristic and scholastic writers are more lengthy.

The fourth division of the introduction is a comparison of the *De regimine principum* of Aegidius Romanus and the *De eruditione filiorum nobilium* of Vincent of Beauvais. In the conclusion to this section, Mr. Steiner brings out the fact that though Aegidius' treatise has been styled the "first philosophical pedagogy," it is clearly dependent on the treatise of Vincent.

In the fifth section there is a thorough treatment and discussion of the manuscripts and editions of the *De eruditione*. This is followed by a section on the various translations of the treatise. Although there have been German and French translations of this treatise, their value has been decreased considerably by inaccuracy. Consequently "the text and the spirit of *De eruditione* are hopelessly lost in the available translations."

The last section of the introduction deals with the

text and apparatus of the present edition. Here the editor states that he did not attempt to verify the scriptural citations. The verification of these citations would have added greatly to the value of the text. An examination of the critical text shows that it has been done very carefully and in a scholarly manner.

In the text proper, as Mr. Steiner states in section seven of the introduction, the spelling of the manuscripts has been kept. This tends to make the reading of the text rather confusing to one not familiar with such variations in spelling. The punctuation has been changed to conform to modern usage. A like change in spelling would have made the text more easily accessible to a larger number of readers.

There is but one index, that of authors cited, arranged alphabetically with a list of works from which quotations were taken. An index of proper names and also one based on subject matter would greatly increase the value and usefulness of this work. However, this work, on the whole, deserves great praise and is a rich contribution not only to the medieval field of Latin literature but also to the field of education.

SISTER ANNE STANISLAUS

CHESTNUT HILL COLLEGE

**Il valore giuridico della celebrazione nuziale cristiana dal primo secolo all'età giustiniana.** By A. L. BALLINI. x, 84 pages. Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1939 (Pubblicazioni dell'Università cattolica del S. Cuore, Serie seconda: Scienze giuridiche, Vol. LXIV) 8 L.

Roman marriage was based upon the mutual consent of the principals, evidenced by a continuing desire to live as man and wife, but the bond might be weakened, and could without difficulty be dissolved, whenever the 'affectio maritalis' waned. Christianity laid greater stress upon the contractual nature of the wedding itself than upon any subsequent change in the feelings of the wedded pair, and Christian marriage became a pledge of a *fides* which was to last for life, a public ceremony vested with religious solemnity, a contract and a sacrament alike. For the clearest definition of the three 'bona nuptialia' (*fides*, *proles*, and *sacramentum*) we are indebted to St. Augustine (e.g., Migne, P. L. 44.404).

What legal validity did the Church claim for this religious form, and to what extent was it recognized by the Roman law? This is the problem chosen by Signor Ballini. Tracing the growth of the new theory from its roots in the Gospels and Pauline Epistles through its later development in the patristic and juridical writings and the conciliar decisions, he shows that the Church acquiesced in the civil forms because they did not conflict with its own basic notions of morality, and was content to advocate the Christian form as a means to



attaining spiritual grace. For instance, St. Ignatius of Antioch recommended, but did not command, that a couple secure the consent of their bishop (Migne, P. G. 5.724), perhaps before the civil ceremony. A second step is exemplified by the hint in Tertullian that vows are administered 'ab episcopo monogamo, presbyteris et diaconis eiusdem sacramenti' (Migne, P. L. 2.993), so as to avoid any imputation of adultery or fornication. Yet civil weddings were regarded as binding, for pagan couples were not required to perform the religious ceremony at the time of their conversion. As late as the fifth century we find that the Church recognized a marriage based on mutual trust alone. A man had married a woman by a simple oath, then had abandoned her, arguing that the marriage was void because it lacked the Church's blessing; later he had taken a second wife according to the religious ritual. One of the popes decreed that the second union was only a form of concubinage because the other woman was the true wife, though wedded without benefit of clergy (Migne, P. L. 50.566).

After the advent of Constantine such significant terms as *festivitas*, *solemnitas*, and *celebritas* begin to appear in the imperial constitutions, together with a firmer insistence on dowries and marriage agreements. But no clear-cut case of collaboration between Church and State is found until 538, when a Novella of Justinian (75.4.1) provides that persons just below the rank of *Illustres* who do not wish to conclude a formal marriage agreement shall appear in church to have their union recorded by the defensor civitatis, so as to insure a means of establishing proof in the future. For the *Illustres* themselves marriage contracts were obligatory (Nov. 117.4), but for the lower classes—soldiers and farm workers—no written form whatever was demanded (Nov. 74.4.3). Yet even the stipulation that persons of a certain class might substitute the ceremony 'in facie Ecclesiae' for a marriage agreement was abrogated a few years later (cf. Nov. 117.4 of 542). And although in the ninth century Charlemagne and Leo the Philosopher prohibited marriage without ecclesiastical benediction, in after time the only legal essential was mutual consent, until in the sixteenth century the Council of Trent at last made the religious ceremony compulsory for members of the Roman Church in the countries under its jurisdiction.

Perhaps through no fault of the author's, this work seems to add little of a factual sort to the pertinent articles in the standard reference works of Hastings and Cabrol-Leclercq. These, incidentally, are not listed in the brief bibliography, where one also misses P. E. Corbett's *Roman Law of Marriage* (Oxford 1930) and P. Meyer's *Der römische Konkubinatus* (Leipzig 1895), not to mention Westermarck's even better known treatise. Those interested in the subject will wish also

to consult H. J. Wolff's recent *Written and Unwritten Marriages in Hellenistic and Postclassical Roman Law* (A. P. A. Monograph No. IX), 97-103. Since his argument is neatly articulated and soberly reasoned, Signor Ballini's monograph is undoubtedly worth having, but his references and citations are not to be trusted for accuracy. In the quotation from St. Ignatius (14) supply  $\eta$  after  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\varsigma$  and change the last  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  to  $\kappa\alpha\tau$ ; in the Latin version (14, note 1) read *nuptiae* for *matrimonium* and insert *sint* after *Dominum*; for Migne, P. L. I. 1302 (15, note 4) read 1415; for 1291 (18, note 2) read 1404; in the citation from Clement of Alexandria (25) insert *enim manum* before *imponit*; in that from the Decretals (58) read *secunda quam for secundo*; in that from St. Leo (60) read *sollicitius* for *solleclitus* and insert *lavacrum* before *baptismatis* in the last sentence; for 621 (60, note 3) read 618; and these are only the more glaring examples. For some unknown reason Greek authors are sometimes quoted from the Latin translation given in the patrology (24, 25, 45, 46). Finally, Italian writers should try to avoid hybrids like *Lattantius*, *Crisostomus*, and *Symmacus* (82, 83).

ROGER A. PACK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

**An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, Volume V. Rome and Italy of the Empire.** By TENNEY FRANK. xvi, 445 pages. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 1940 (Together with the General Index, \$5.75)

It was appropriate that Frank's volume on Rome and Italy of the Republic and his present volume should open and close the Survey of which he was editor. It is clear, however, from the Preface that the manuscript for this volume was far from ready for the press at the time of Professor Frank's death and that the amount of labor the preparation of it involved for many of his former students, notably for Miss Clift and Mrs. Loane, was great indeed. The General Index, of 140 pages under separate cover, to the five volumes is the work of T. R. S. Broughton and Lily Ross Taylor, undertaken as a "tribute to our friend and teacher." It contains, in addition to the usual subject index, special lists which will be especially useful to students of *Literary Passages Quoted in Translation*, of *Inscriptions*, of *Papyri*, of *Ostraca*, and of *Parchments*.

It is a tribute to Professor Frank that his former students were willing to undertake the great task of giving to scholars the last conclusions from his life of unrelenting research. These they had to collect painstakingly from marginal notes of his original manuscript, from directions for revision, from materials and notes among his papers, from recent lectures which



he delivered as George Eastman Visiting Professor at Oxford, from dissertations written under his direction, from former articles; from such materials his manuscript was completed. Professor Taylor provided some newer data for the section on Ostia. The section on *terra sigillata* (188-94) is by Professor Howard Comfort. In the place of the chapter on Diocletian which Frank had planned, the volume contains the text and translation by Elsa Rose Graser of that emperor's Edict on Maximum Prices.

Scholars will always be grateful to the students of Professor Frank for this final service to his memory. They clearly did the best they could with the material as they found it. But they scarcely dared add to what they found, and so the volume remains little more than an outline. This conclusion can be drawn from a consideration not only of the statements in the Foreword by Mrs. Frank and in the Preface, and of the style and contents, but also from the size of the volume. For Frank required 407 pages in his first volume to describe Rome and Italy to 30 B.C., whereas less than 300 pages of this volume represent his studies of the later period, for which the inscriptions furnish such abundant and trustworthy source material as compared with the literary sources for the earlier period. One suspects that if Frank had lived to complete the volume it would have been double its present size. As the volume now stands it is a chart which other mariners on the seas of economic history will follow with assurance as they fill in unplotted waters and further refine preliminary designations and soundings.

In general the conclusions on this period do not differ materially from the author's views as they are so widely known from his *Economic History*. In the Augustan period the large fortunes were gained, not from commercial ventures, but as rewards for military service and for partnership in the political ascendancy of the Julio-Claudian house. A prosperous middle class was totally lacking in the Augustan period and emerges first about the time of the Flavians. The development of industry was made impossible first and foremost by the slave system which supplied the needs of the wealthiest sections by domestic production and stifled labor-saving devices, by the lack of a patent system, and by "the legal prohibition in private business of what would now be called joint stock companies of limited liability" (217). There is little if any evidence of "commercial policies" on the part of the emperors. "The emperors did not depart from the ancient custom of *laissez-faire*: 'mercantilism' and 'protection' were never seriously tried" (295). It was Septimius Severus who gave the death blow to the economic life of the empire by "his confiscations and his centralizing the ownership of vast estates under imperial control" (85; cp. 300). In time he became "owner of most of the good arable land throughout the empire" (300). It was

this enormous wealth which caused so many generals in the next fifty years to strike for the throne.—In these last sentences is a thesis which should engender much further research.

Frank summarizes the economic decline in the following sentences: "During the first century of the Empire the monarchy became ever more autocratic and encouraged the private exploitation of the resources of the provinces under the *pax Romana*. Individual initiative disappeared in government and industry. The third century was a period of anarchy which ended in a totalitarian government with an economic system centering about the emperor and his army that saved the state for the final dry rot. In a word, the decline of Rome may in the last analysis be attributed to the failure of vision on the part of the landed gentry: their willingness during the Republic to betray the free yeomanry for the sake of profitable estates worked by slaves; and their readiness during the Empire to accept a totalitarian regime for the sake of the prospect of personal safety" (304).

C. H. OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

### **The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian.**

By A. H. M. JONES. x, 393 pages. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1940 21s.

This is a companion book to the author's *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 1937. While the other gives a historical survey of the Greek and Hellenized cities of the Near East in the Hellenistic, Roman, and early Byzantine times, a kind of catalogue raisonné, the book under review is intended to show "the development of the Greek city under the rule of kings and emperors."

The book is divided into five parts, each one with subdivisions. Part I deals with the "diffusion of civic institutions on the Greek model over the barbarian lands of the Near East." The term "barbarian" apparently includes the highly civilized, age-old urban centers of the Near East. The subject is treated chronologically in five sections: the work of the kings, Hellenization, the Roman Republic, the principate, the Byzantine age. This is followed by Part II, which deals with the "relations of the central government to the cities." It is again subdivided chronologically into four sections: Hellenistic, Roman Republic, Roman Empire, and Byzantine Empire. In Part III the author discusses some aspects of the internal political and constitutional development of the cities in three sections: Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine. Part IV reviews the services rendered by the civic government to the citizens, covering the topics: material needs, education, religion and games, public works and records, and finance, in a

systematic rather than a chronological order except for the Byzantine period, which is dealt with separately. And finally Part V describes "the contributions of the cities to Greek civilization" under three sub-headings: economic, political and administrative, cultural.

The book is well planned, well presented and written in a fluent, lucid style. The presentation is based both on the material dealt with by the author in his earlier book and on new evidence carefully collected by him for the purpose. The subject of the book is not new to students of ancient history. The evolution of the cities in the Hellenistic times and in the early and late Roman Empire both in the East and in the West has often been treated and discussed by prominent scholars from different points of view and with different methods. This is however the first time that the development of the Greek city in the Hellenistic East has been dealt with separately, not with antiquarian but with historical aims, with the interest of the author centering on evolution and on the rôle played by the Greek cities in the general development of the ancient world in Hellenistic and Roman times. Jones' book therefore fills a gap, and is a welcome addition to its predecessors. It certainly will be extensively used by all the students of Hellenistic and Roman History. The most valuable part of it is that which presents the material illustrating the history of the Greek cities in the late Roman and early Byzantine Empire, a subject badly neglected by most of the historians of the late Roman Empire.

In this short review I cannot discuss the many points on which I disagree with the author. The reader may compare for the Hellenistic age my own treatment of some of the same problems in my forthcoming book, *A Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. I may however briefly mention the peculiar ways and methods followed by the author in treating the various problems dealt with in his book, methods which he has used in his previous book also and which seem to be very popular with many younger students of ancient history.

His often ingenious and stimulating suggestions and statements in the text are supported by references in the notes to the sources (in very brief form) and occasionally by a reference to one or another modern work. In addition a small number of modern works is listed at the end of the book. The readers of the book must be warned that in his references the author does not aim at completeness, especially as regards modern works. His "bibliography" at the end of the book is, as he says himself, merely a list of books which he found useful. In citing the ancient sources (I mean chiefly the inscriptions and papyri) he never endeavors to refer to recent modern efforts to improve one or another text, but quotes it as it stands in the *Corpus* or in the first editions. This procedure is not negligent but intentional. I regard it as wrong and misleading. The reader

of Jones' book must be aware that he must himself do the tedious but indispensable work neglected by the author.

I may quote in support of this statement, especially as regards modern works, a few instances which could easily be multiplied. These will show that the system followed by the author, easy as it is for him, will always be a handicap to his fellow students and makes them perhaps unduly reserved in regard to the sometimes sweeping and radical statements which he makes.

In speaking (2) of the Hellenization of the Thracians by Philip and Alexander Mr. Jones fails to mention the interesting fragmentary letter of Alexander found at Philippi about the settlement of Thracians in the territory of Philippi. The text is not yet published in full, but it has been quoted in part several times, e.g., P. Collart, *Philippi* (1937) 179, and L. Robert, *RPh* 13 (1939) 176.

In dealing (23ff.) with the numbers of Macedonians and Greeks in the Hellenistic monarchies Jones neglects the important evidence of Polybius regarding the composition and number of the rival armies of Raphia, evidence studied several times and recently discussed in its bearing on the problem of the population of Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Syria by A. Segré, *Bull. Soc. Arch. Alex.* 29 (1934) 257ff. For forming a general idea (statistics are not available) of the numbers and places of origin of the Greek-speaking settlers of Ptolemaic Egypt (23ff.) Mr. Jones has not made use of the accurate tabulations of F. M. Heichelheim, *Die auswärtige Bevölkerung* etc. (cf. his supplements in *APF*) and of W. Peremans, *Vreemdelingen en Egyptenaren* etc., 1937. New and startling data regarding the Greek population of Alexandria will be found, by the way, in the interesting "Gerusy Acts" published and discussed by the late A. v. Premenstein, *Schriften d. Univ. zu Giessen*, 1936 (published in 1939). The same document yields important and apparently reliable evidence on the Gerusia of Alexandria in the time of Caligula, which was certainly not a "club" of old men (cf. Jones 225ff.). It came probably too late to be used by the author.

In the chapter on Hellenization the author confidently says (34): "no Hellenistic buildings have survived save in the Greek lands." Every archaeologist knows that this is not true: Hellenistic buildings are still extant (of course in ruins) in North India (Taxila), in Persia (see E. Herzfeld, *Archaeological History of Iran*, 1935), in Dura-Europos (the temples of Artemis and of Zeus Olympios of this city can be restored in their Hellenistic shape; I may note en passant that in general very little use is made of the material yielded by Dura), in Palestine and the Transjordan (C. Watzinger, *Denkmäler Palastinas II*, 1935). Moreover, not in Egypt alone were new temples of local type and in local style built in Hellenistic times.

Hellenistic temples of Babylonian type are among the most prominent features of the ruins of Uruk (Orchoi). The same Uruk yields, by the way, very important evidence for the constitution and life of a native Babylonian city in Hellenistic times with many Greek settlers but not transformed into a Greek city. The material from this city is not mentioned by Mr. Jones (cf. page 36) though it has been recently studied and illustrated in a masterly way by A. Aymard, *REA* 40 (1938) 5ff.

The same method is followed by the author in the other sections of his book. I may note at random that in the section dealing with the sale of priesthoods (162, 228) no mention is made of the paper of M. Segre, 'Osservazioni epigrafiche sulla vendita di Sacerdoti,' *Rend. R. Instit. Lombardo* 70 (1937), where Segre has collected in full all the evidence and has proved that sale of priesthoods was confined to the

cities of Asia Minor. For the important problem of the grain supply (217) the author cites the excellent but antiquated paper of Francotte and never mentions the fuller treatments of the problem by Gernet and by Heichelheim (art. Sitos in P.-W.-K.). The discussion of the *cursus publicus* (141f. and 157f.) is based on Seeck's article in P.-W. while the problem has recently been studied more fully by E. J. Holmberg, *Zur Geschichte des cursus publicus*, 1933, cf. Plaume, 'Cursus Publicus,' *Mém. Sav. Étr. Ac. Inscr.* 14. Lack of space forbids me to cite more examples. However, such as it is the book of Jones is a fine contribution to our knowledge. His conclusions in the last part (achievement of the cities) are very pessimistic. One need not share his views, but it is certain that many of his statements in this last part are stimulating and worth considering.

M. ROSTOVITZ

YALE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Norman T. Pratt, Jr., of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

For microprint or photoprint copies of articles abstracted send 1c per page for microprint, or 10c per page for photoprint, plus a service charge of 20c for each item, to Bibliofilm Service, Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D. C. The Service reserves the right to except material readily available elsewhere.

GOMME, A. W. *Two Notes on the Athenian Tribute Lists*. Arguments against two conclusions adopted by Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor in their work on the Tribute Lists: (1) that no tribute was collected for the year 449-448; (2) that πόλεις αὐτὰι φόρον ταχσάμεναι means 'cities assessed separately.'

(Jones)

OERTEL, FRIEDRICH. *Zur Ammonsohnschaft Alexanders*. The declaration that Alexander was the son of Ammon was made in a public greeting designed for extraordinary effect—what might be called a quasi-oracle. Clitarchus' version of the event is not entirely accurate, but it is closer to the facts than the other versions.

(Heller)

POWELL, J. ENOCH. *Greek Timekeeping*. The Greeks in classical times were not familiar with the sundial, and the passage in Herodotus (2.109.3) describing one is an example of Alexandrine interpolation.

(Jones)

PRITCHETT, W. KENDRICK. *The Term of Office of Attic Strategoi*. Criticism of H. B. Mayor's theory that the Attic Strategoi entered office at the beginning of the campaigning season rather than at the beginning of the civil year.

AJPh 61 (1940) 469-74

(De Lacy)

ROBINSON, C. A. JR. *Alexander's Plans*. Although the hypomnemata preserved by Diodorus are not reliable, there is a trustworthy passage in Arrian which proves that Alexander had planned to circumnavigate Africa.

AJPh 61 (1940) 402-12

(De Lacy)

ROGERS, ROBERT SAMUEL. *Drusus Caesar's Tribunician Power*. Drusus received the tribunician power

"within the first four or five months of A.D. 22," probably in March or April.

AJPh 61 (1940) 457-9

(De Lacy)

WESTLAKE, H. D. *Corinth and the Argive Coalition*. By the alliance with Argos after the Peace of Nicias the Corinthians hoped to renew the war against Athens. They did not intend that the alliance be directed against Sparta.

AJPh 61 (1940) 413-21

(De Lacy)

ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

GRÉGOIRE, HENRI. *L'énigme de Tahta*. The much-discussed cartouche of a Roman emperor, found at Tahta, is explained as that of Maximinus Daia, nephew of the emperor Galerius. The inscription is probably to be dated between 305 and 310 A.D.

CE 15 (1940) 119-23

(Husselman)

JACOBSTAHN, P. and JONES, A. H. M. *A Silver Find from South-West Asia Minor*. Two inscribed silver plaques (about 15.5 and 11 cm. in diameter) with busts of Zeus and Ares respectively and fragments of wreath found at Seki Bazar. They apparently had adorned statues of these gods. Inscriptions reveal that the demos of Myangla paid for the plaque of Zeus while an individual contributed the money for the Ares plaque. The dates depend upon the era used; 70 and 25 A.D. or 180 and 135 A.D. for the Zeus and Ares plaques respectively, are suggested. Illustrated.

JRS 30 (1940) 16-31

(Reinmuth)

LAMEERE, WILLIAM. *Un symbole pythagoricien dans l'art funéraire de Rome*. In the light of more recent interpretations the author examines the explanation given by F. De Ruyt (*Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome*, 1936) of the details that appear on the principal face of a sarcophagus, of the second half of the third century A.D., discovered some years ago at Pantano-Borghese, near Rome and now in the collections of the Musées royaux du Cinquantenaire at Brussels. Particular attention is given to the problem of the mystical meaning of the drapery (parapetasma) that two genii hold outstretched over the head of the bust of a young girl in the centre of the decoration. Ill.

BCH 63 (1939) 43-85

(Krauss)



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Compiled by Lionel Casson and Bluma L. Trell from the American, British, French and German weekly, and Italian monthly, bibliographical publications, and from books received at the editorial offices. Prices have not been confirmed.

## ENCYCLOPAEDIA

Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft<sup>2</sup>, edited by GEORG WISSOWA, WILHELM KROLL and KARL MITTELHAUS. Supplementband VII, Adobogiona bis Τρικαδιεύς, mit Nachträgen. 1664 columns. Metzler, Stuttgart 1940 33 M.

## ANCIENT AUTHORS

**Aristotle.** "Wir wollen von der Freundschaft reden ..." Buch VIII und IX der Nikomachischen Ethik des Aristoteles. Translated by HANS VON ARNIM with an introduction by WALTER F. OTTO. 52 pages. Junker & Dünhaupt, Berlin 1939 (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Bd 246) 2.40 M.

**Columella.** L. Iuni Moderati Columellae opera quae exstant. Fasc. quartus Rei rusticae libros sextum et septimum continens, edited by V. LUNDSTRÖM. 157 pages. Eranos, Göteborg 1940 (Coll. script. veterum Upsalien-sis) 8 kr.

**Isocrates.** LESLIE FRANCIS SMITH. The Genuineness of the Ninth and Third Letters of Isocrates. 44 pages. Lancaster 1940 (Dissertation: obtainable from the author at Orono, Maine) \$1

**Itineraria Romana.** Volumen alterum. Ravenatis Anonymi Cosmographia et Guidonis Geographica, edited by JOSEPH SCHNETZ. x, 142 pages. Teubner, Leipzig 1940 12.60 M.

**Plautus.** W. E. J. KUIPER. The Greek Aulularia. A study of the original of Plautus' masterpiece. vii, 141 pages. Brill, Leyden 1940 (Mnemosyne, Supplement II)

**Theophrastus.** OTTO REGENBOGEN. Theophrastos von Eresos. Columns 1354-1561. Metzler, Stuttgart 1940 (Offprint from Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll-Mittelhaus, Supplementband VII, obtainable separately) 5.80 M.

## CHRISTIAN AUTHORS

**Euchologium sinaiticum.** R. GRAFFIN. Patrologia orientalis, T. XXV. Euchologium sinaiticum. Texte slave avec sources grecques et trad. française par J. FREEK. Firmin-Didot, Paris 1940 80 fr.

**John Chrysostom.** D'ALTON, J. F. Selections from St. John Chrysostom. The Greek Text edited with Introduction and Commentary. viii, 395 pages. Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London 1940 8s. 6d.

**John Malalas.** Chronicle of John Malalas, Books VIII-XVIII, translated from the Church Slavonic by MATTHEW SPINKA in collaboration with GLANVILLE DOWNEY. vi, 150 pages. University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1940) \$1.50

**Paulinus.** Paulinus' Churches at Nola. Texts, Translations and Commentary, by R. C. GOLDSCHMIDT. 203 pages, 1 plate. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, Amsterdam 1940 4.50 fl.

**Synesius of Cyrene.** Synesii Cyrenensis Hymni, recensuit N. TERZAGHI. xcvi, 323 pages. Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, Rome 1939 55 l.

## LITERARY HISTORY. CRITICISM

BRADNER, LEICESTER. Musae Anglicanae. A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry, 1500-1925. xii, 383 pages. Modern Language Association of America, New York 1940

(Modern Language Association of America, General Series X)

HUNT, EDMUND. Iohannis Dominici Lucula Noctis, xxxi, 432 pages. Notre Dame 1940 (University of Notre Dame, Publications in Mediaeval Studies IV)

Revue des études latines. 17<sup>e</sup> année. Fasc. II. 2<sup>e</sup> semestre 1939. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1940

THOMPSON, C. R. The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More. 52 pages. Author, Ithaca 1940

WILCOX, S. The Destructive Hypothetical Syllogism in Greek Logic and in Attic Oratory. 143 pages. New Haven 1938 (Dissertation, Yale)

WILLIAMS, EDWIN EVERITT. Tragedy of Destiny. Oedipus Tyrannus, Macbeth, Athalie. 35 pages. Editions XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Cambridge 1940 \$0.80

WORKMAN, SAMUEL K. Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence in English Prose. 210 pages. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1940 (9s.)

## ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

ALBRECHT, C., K. REGLING and A. OXÉ. Das Römerlager in Oberaden und das Uferkastell in Beckinghausen an der Lippe, Heft I: Bodenfund, Münzen, Sigillaten und Inschriften. 82 pages, 15 figures, 59 plates, 3 folding plans. Dortmund 1938 (Veröffentlichungen aus dem städt. Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte Dortmund, Band II) 30 M.

FREMERSDORF, FRITZ. Römische Gläser aus Köln. 32 pages, 52 plates of which four in color. Volker-Verlag, Köln and Leipzig 1939 (Schriften der R.-G. Abteilung des Wallraf-Richartz-Museums, Köln, Heft 2)

GÜTSCHOW, M. Das Museum der Prätextat-Katacombe. 268 pages, 44 figures, 45 plates. Città del Vaticano 1938 (Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Serie III: Memorie, 4,2)

HENRY, FRANCOISE. Irish Art in the Early Christian Period. xix, 220 pages, 55 figures, 80 plates. Methuen, London (1940) 25s.

HERZFELD, ERNST. Iran in the Ancient East. 600 pages, 120 plates, 427 figures. Oxford University Press, London 1940 (\$40)

SACHS, CURT. The History of Musical Instruments. 505 pages, ill., diagrams. Norton, New York 1940 \$5

SCHMIDT, ERICH F. Flights over Ancient Cities of Iran. 119 plates, 6 maps (folio). University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1940 \$20

VAN ESSEN, C. C. Sulla als Bouwheer. 32 pages, 19 figures. Wolters, Groningen 1940

## MISCELLANEOUS

Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 80 pages. Beck, Munich 1939 2 M.

Jahrbuch der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jg 1939. 285 pages. De Gruyter, Berlin 1940 5 M.

MEERDINK, J. Ariadne. Een onderzoek naar de oorspronkelijke betekenis en de ontwikkeling der Godin. 142 pages. Veenman & Zonen, Wageningen

Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift f. klass. Philologie. Edited by JOHANNES MEWALDT. Bd 57 Jg 1939, H. 1/2: Festgabe Edmund Hauler. 204 pages. Höfels, Wien 1939 12 M.

Yale Classical Studies, edited by AUSTIN M. HARMON, ALFRED R. BELLINGER, HENRY T. ROWELL and ROBERT O. FINK. Volume 7. 317 pages, 4 figures, 2 plates. Yale University Press, New Haven 1940 \$3